

C
H65K
1910

HOBART COLLEGE BULLETINS

Vol. VIII

JULY, 1910

No. 4, Part 1

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

Proceedings of Commencement Phi Beta Kappa Address

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE



SEP 1 1910

Published by Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. Issued quarterly
Entered October 28, 1902, at Geneva, N. Y., as second-class
matter, under Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

PROCEEDINGS OF COMMENCEMENT

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

The exercises of the eighty-fifth Commencement began with the sermon before the College on Sunday morning, June twelfth, at Trinity Church, delivered by the Reverend Gustav A. Carstensen, Ph.D., of the class of 1873. The Baccalaureate sermon was preached at Trinity Church, Sunday evening by the Reverend Alexander Mann, D.D., of the class of 1881, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. Wednesday was designated as Alumni Day and on that day were held the meetings of the Trustees and the Associate Alumni and in the evening the Alumni Smoker. This was an informal social gathering without speeches and was enthusiastically enjoyed by a large number of alumni.

In order to make the week less crowded, Commencement Day has been placed on Thursday and on that day the procession formed as usual in front of the Library, General William Wilson, '76, acting as marshal. Thence the academic body proceeded to the Opera House. The Latin Salutatory was delivered by John Edward Thompson and an Oration by Charles Kendall Robbins on Buddhism and Christianity. The Phi Beta Kappa orator for the day was Doctor Henry Rutgers Marshall of New York City. The address is printed in full in this bulletin. Following this address the President awarded the prizes for the year and conferred the degrees in course on seven bachelors or arts, thirteen bachelors of science and two masters of science. Doctor Leighton then presented the candidates for honorary degrees with the words which follow and the President conferred the degrees.

"Mr. President and Members of the Board of Trustees and Faculty of Hobart College: I have the pleasure to present the candidates for honorary degrees:—For the degree of Doctor of Letters, Professor Wilfred Harold Munro, M.A., of Brown University. Professor Munro has had a long and highly useful career as Principal of important schools and later as Professor of History in Brown University. For the degree of Doctor of Science I present Professor Warren Plimpton Lombard of the University of Michigan and Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Leipsic. Doctor Lombard has made valuable contributions to his chosen science of Physiology in addition to his efficient services as a teacher thereof at Clark and Michigan Universities. For the degree of Doctor of Science I also present Doctor Henry Rutgers Marshall of New York City, who, while practicing his profession of architect, has found time and mental energy to write important works on psychological aesthetics and the psychology of religion, and more recently, has produced a very acute and thorough analysis of the nature of consciousness. For the degree of Doctor of Theology I present the Reverend Doctor Gustav Arnold Carstensen of the class of 1873, Hobart College, M.A., 1878. In addition to his usefulness as minister of the Gospel, Doctor Carstensen has proved himself to be a man of scholarly interests and attainments and has rendered good service to the Church as Secretary of the Church Congress."

The Alumni Dinner was attended by one hundred and fifty alumni and guests and was an unusually enthusiastic occasion. The academic guests of the day and representatives of the decade classes from 1860 to 1910 and from the class of 1905 spoke, every alumnus ex-

pressing hearty approval of the recent progress of the College and a loyal determination to aid the present administration in every way.

In rising for the eighth time to address the Alumni the President paid fitting tribute to the memories of Hon. S. H. Hammond, Dr. Herbert M. Eddy and Mr. S. Douglas Cornell. He commended in particular the efficient and highly creditable manner in which Dean Milton H. Turk and Mrs. Katharine M. Hussey had discharged the difficult duties entailed upon them by their positions in William Smith College, and, after announcing the gifts of the year amounting in all to thirty-three thousand dollars, appealed to the Alumni for hearty and united assistance in raising the endowment fund so urgently needed for the conduct and development of the College. Upon this subject he said in part: "Hobart College requires an additional endowment fund of at least five hundred thousand dollars, and one hundred and fifty thousand of this sum is an absolute necessity by January 1st, 1912. A committee appointed by the Board of Trustees has already prepared a plan for obtaining this one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and has distributed circulars soliciting subscriptions. In response it has received pledges to the amount of twenty-five hundred dollars. Here at present the matter rests and here it will no doubt continue to rest unless the Alumni and friends of the College take up the cry for an endowment and inaugurate a vigorous and enthusiastic campaign in its pursuit. This campaign should be thoroughly organized and in the coming autumn I shall do what in me lies to make this organization complete and efficient. Every man can do something, either out of his own pocket or from among his friends while some can do a great deal if they only will.

Now your President in his kindly introduction of myself this afternoon announced that I might have among other things a word of rebuke to administer. Well, as a matter of fact, rebuke is not in my heart and, therefore, it should not be on my lips; but while I am without a word of rebuke, I have a word of very earnest suggestion to offer. All of the Alumni here this afternoon love Hobart College and what is true of you is true of every Alumnus throughout the land. But although you love Hobart College the thought of her gets crowded out of your minds by the proximate duties and pressing avocations of life. You are scattered all over the country and indeed all over the world: many of you have not been back to Geneva for years, while some have never revisited these halls since the day of their graduation. Absence from Geneva and the cares and labors of life lead not unnaturally to forgetfulness of the College. You have not ceased to love her, she has simply been thrust out of your consciousness or below its threshold. To tear a leaf from my friend, Dr. Marshall's address of this morning, she has been relegated to the field of sub-attentive consciousness. Now my object this afternoon and indeed on every occasion when I have the opportunity of speaking to the Alumni is to bring the College up above the threshold of your consciousness, to touch the affection you have for her, to revive the memories of former days, to make you vividly aware of her existence and so induce you to remember and assist her. She is doing a great work, if not in quantity, in quality and character. She is to-day better equipped than ever before and in every way worthy of your enthusiastic support.

We urge you then to come back and see her as she is and we urge you also to keep her in mind and work assiduously for the raising of this one hundred and fifty thousand dollars by January 1st, 1912. And I press this upon your attention not because I am in love with brick and mortar and desire to make a fair show in the flesh but because we need a strong and adequate physical basis for the carrying out of a great spiritual work. It is the moral and intellectual life of the College on which my eye is fixed and my heart is set; for it is this life which gives to the institution its meaning and value and which endows her sons with the high qualities of the loyal citizen and the faithful child of God. It is this life too which associates her work and influence with the moral and intellectual being of all time. Hobart is indeed but a little system of spiritual life but by virtue of this spiritual life she enters into communion with other large systems and with spiritual life as a whole. Indeed, if it were not for the great spiritual end and object, I would not plead with you to help me get this one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Without this spiritual end and object I would not ask you to work for one hundred and fifty thousand cents. But with the spiritual aim in view and with the inspiration of that aim in the heart we can all go forth to the material task with the glorious sense of a noble and exalted endeavor. By that endeavor we shall obtain the money we require but the real object achieved will be that increased opportunity for the moral and intellectual man and that added strength and vision by which he will more perfectly fulfil the functions of spiritual life and discover wider and more intimate relations with the source of spiritual life which is the everlasting God."

PHI BETA KAPPA ADDRESS

June 16th, 1910

By HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL, L.H.D.

You would not have invited me to address you on this occasion I imagine had I not during many years taken great interest in the study of Psychology: and I shall therefore ask you to consider with me a phenomenon of our conscious life that seems most mysterious to a very large number of thoughtful people, attempting to show that this mystery disappears if the facts are correctly related with our every day experience. I shall then ask you to note certain implications of the conceptions by which we are enabled to make this explanation.

It is the part of the skilled orator to open his address with statements calculated to yield in his hearers pleasing anticipations; and from this point of view it is perhaps unwise for me thus to announce that I propose to explain a mystery. For mysteries are ever fascinating to mankind, and their explanation in terms of the commonplace is something the average man does not at all enjoy. He, even at times refuses to allow them to be explained away as we see today in relation to the activities of the famous medium, Eusapia Pallidino.

It is just because we love mysteries that science is repulsive to many in the fact that it yields so many cold blooded disillusionments. Yet this disillusionment is of the very essence of advance in intelligence; and not a few thinking people are depressed as they look forward to a future in which science will hold full sway and which will

be lacking in all pleasures of imagination and of wonder. And in truth there would be warrant for this depression were it not for the fact that each explanation of a mystery turns out to be merely its statement in terms of some more fundamental one, upon which our attention is thus concentrated; one which might otherwise have been over-looked, and which gives new scope to the imagination, becomes the source of new delights, and serves as the stimulus to new investigations.

Thus, after all, I hope you will find what I have to say not too repulsive; for you will discover that, so far as I am successful, I attempt no more than the explanation of certain problems of our conscious life in terms of more profound psychological mysteries; in which we may all find deeper delight, and some of you I hope the stimulus to a more thorough study of the nature of consciousness.

The phenomenon of our mental life to which I refer is commonly spoken of as sub-consciousness. The realm of the sub-conscious is commonly thought of as part of us and yet a part to which are attributable all sorts of characteristics and mysterious powers diverse from those noted in our every day reflective life. I shall aim to show that this view is unwarranted.

And in beginning I shall ask you to take with me a somewhat wild flight of the imagination, shall ask you to assume that there has dropped down in our midst what we may speak of as a spirit, a spirit from Mars, let us say: a spirit of supreme intelligence that has gained a large body of such knowledge as we have reached, and that has a rare capacity for gaining knowledge, and yet is unprejudiced, as we poor mortals are, by authority, tradition or custom.

In the interests of brevity, I may, in the course of these remarks, be led to assume that this spirit is of the male sex. If I do so, I wish in advance to make my apologies to our friends the Suffragettes.

Now our spirit from Mars may be supposed to turn to us with this question: "I have been studying men and the higher animals in general, and I have noticed a coordinate development of the nervous system and of intelligence. Have you?"

We are ready to reply that this is of course a matter of common knowledge, so common indeed that we agree with our expert neurologists and psychologists that there can be no change in consciousness without a corresponding change in the activity of the nervous system.

To this our Martian replies "I had not thought of it in this way. You say that there can be no change in consciousness without a corresponding change in the activity of nerve. I suppose you find the reverse of this true. That is I suppose you find there can be no change in the activity of nerve without a corresponding change in consciousness."

To this you are likely to answer promptly, "Oh, no. We find many changes in nerve activity within the body that involve no changes in consciousness at all; for instance what we call our reflex actions."

To this our Martian replies, "I am a stickler for logic, and it seems very strange to me that you find the facts as you state them, viz., find that there can be no change in consciousness without a change in the activity of the nervous system, and yet do not find that there can be no change in the activity of the nervous system without a change in consciousness. I should naturally expect the

correspondence, if it exists at all, to be a thoroughgoing one both ways.

“But perhaps we do not understand each other. I think I comprehend what you mean when you speak of changes in nerve activity, but I am not quite so sure that I understand what you mean by the word consciousness, for unless I am mistaken I have found you using it in two different ways. In the first place I have heard certain discussions in which it was stated that inorganic objects such as stones have no consciousness; and a number of your philosophers, among them the noted Fechner, have considered the possibility of plants having consciousnesses. Now here the word consciousness is used to refer to what I should speak of as psychic existence as such.

“But I have also heard you use the word in an entirely different sense. The other day I listened to a conversation between two ladies, one of whom said, ‘I went to the opera last night, and there met a friend whom I had not seen for fifteen years; and I was so much interested in talking over old times that I was not conscious of the music.’ Now here evidently there must have been for that individual lady some psychic existence due to the music played by the orchestra and sung by the actors, and to the brilliant lighting of the hall and the moving people. What she meant to indicate was that she was not *aware* of this music, etc. In other words what she meant to say was that there was a great deal of psychic existence for her of which she was not aware.

“You use the word consciousness in very much the same way in cases of forgetfulness when you are likely to say that you are not conscious that you did such and such a thing, although you must acknowledge that you were clearly conscious of your act at the time you performed

it. What you really mean in such a case is that you are not aware of what you were then conscious of.

"Now what I have thus called awareness must be psychic existence, although it need not necessarily be the whole of psychic existence. In other words there may be some psychic existence that is not in the field of awareness; and that this is highly probable will appear clear to you when you notice that you never can experience awareness as an isolated existence. The object of which you are aware stands out clearly, but always within a field of psychic existence which spreads away from it like an aura. Awareness thus appears to be a narrow field within psychic existence, and what I wish to call to your attention is the fact that you use the one word consciousness to apply to both the narrow field of awareness and to the broader field of psychic existence."

"Yes," you are likely to reply, "you are right. When I speak of stones having no consciousness, I refer to psychic existence as such; and in describing the opera box experience, the lady certainly referred to awareness. But what difference does it make that we do thus use the word in two senses?"

"Well," he replies, "I think it makes a great deal of difference. It seems to me to lead you into all sorts of inconsistencies of thought. For instance, I hear your psychologists talk of thresholds of consciousness. All of you know what they mean by a threshold who watched the illumination of the electric tower at Buffalo from a distance of say one-quarter of a mile. From the signals given, you knew that the electric current was turned on, and that every little lamp on the surface of the tower was beginning to glow; but the appearance of the tower remained unchanged for a while, and then suddenly

became pink. The moment of this change is the moment when the so-called threshold is passed.

"Now in speaking of this threshold your psychologists surely imply that there is something on the one side of the threshold of the same nature as that on the other side. In other words, that there was something psychic existing before you became aware of the change; and in my opinion they should speak not of thresholds of consciousness, but of thresholds of awareness within consciousness, which is broader than awareness.

"Then again you argued a moment ago that it was impossible to say that all changes in nerve activity correspond with changes in consciousness. Now here, you evidently use the word consciousness as meaning awareness. But I have made no claim that all nerve changes involve changes of awareness. What I am concerned to argue is that all nerve changes correspond with some forms of change in psychic existence, which is a very different matter. So you see that your objection was not well taken. If you view the matter as I do, you will see that it becomes possible to hold that the correspondence between mental and nervous changes is thoroughgoing both ways; agreeing that in certain cases the mental changes corresponding with the nervous changes are not within the field of awareness, but are psychic existents within what we may call the field of sub-awareness."

And now our Martian turns to the problem with which we opened our discussion. He says, "you are all puzzled, I find, by what you call sub-consciousness. Now it seems to me that what you mean by this sub-consciousness is that part of consciousness (or psychic existence) that is below the threshold of awareness. As I said a moment ago you never can have an experience of awareness with-

out realizing that the object of which you are aware is only part of a very much broader field of consciousness. So you see that there is no mystery in connection with this so-called sub-consciousness. It is merely what I have called above the field of sub-awareness; or if you choose you may speak of it as the field of sub-attentive consciousness.

"Now, as there is every reason to hold that all activities of the nervous system are of the same general nature, so we must hold that all parts of consciousness are of the same general nature. From what we know of the field of awareness, therefore, we may judge the nature of the field of sub-awareness. As it is a part of the whole of your consciousness, you certainly need not fear lest it act in a sinister manner as might some power outside of you. Nor can you rely upon it to perform wonders that are foreign to the effects observed in connection with that part of consciousness of which you are aware in reflection."

Let us suppose that our Martian spirit now leaves us for other parts of the universe, perhaps to look after our astronomer Lowell's canals. Being thus removed from his influence, let us consider for a moment certain implications of his theory of a thoroughgoing correspondence between changes in the activity of nerve and changes in consciousness.

When I was a young man I was taught to look upon the brain somewhat as if it were a collection or aggregate of separately functioning centres. There was the optic centre and there was the auditory centre, etc., etc.; and these were spoken of as though they were almost independent of one another. And when I first commenced to study psychology I found most authorities treating of mind in like manner as a collection of separately function-

ing faculties which work together to be sure, but each of which was treated as though it were an individual thing.

The modern psychologist, however, finds himself led to look upon the brain as being a system of minor systems of nerve elements. You understand, of course, what I mean by a minor system: It is a system of parts, each one of which is more closely related to every other part of this minor system than it is with any part or parts of the large system to which the minor system belongs. As an example of such a minor nerve system, we may take the auditory centre which is a highly complex nerve system, and yet itself merely a minor system in the whole sensory system, which sensory system taken as a whole is in turn a more complex minor system in the whole brain system.

Now it is very interesting to note that, quite independently of neurological investigations, modern psychologists since Herbart's time have been gradually coming to look upon mind as a great system of minor systems of psychic elements. For instance, the sense of sight gives us a great systematized variety of colors, etc.; yet this sense of sight is but one of a number of senses, each of which is equally complex, and all of which together form what we call the realm of sensation. But this complex realm of sensation is itself a minor system in the still greater system of consciousness in which other systems than sensations, e. g., the emotional and intellectual systems, are of equal importance.

When we consider the matter more thoroughly, we discover that the brain system of systems is really only part of the whole nerve system, the part which is packed away in the little bony box that we call our skull. If the whole nerve system could be spread out on a plain surface the part which corresponds with the brain would indeed

appear the most important part, and the part in which the most notable activities occur, but it would not appear so radically different from the rest of the nervous system as it usually is held to be. In my opinion had we in the beginning approached the study of the brain from the standpoint generally adopted today, it never would have occurred to us to look upon the brain as the organ of mind. Then we would have looked upon the activities in the whole nervous system as the basis of mental phenomena, the brain being of course the preeminently important part of the great system.

In this connection there are two points to be noted: First; if the theory of a thoroughgoing correspondence is true, then consciousness in man must correspond with the whole pulse of the activities in his whole nervous system. Second; if any one of you is warranted in holding that any other man than himself has consciousness, then he is compelled to agree that all animals having coordinated nervous systems must have corresponding consciousnesses. So far as the higher animals are concerned this latter view meets with no opposition, for we all agree that they have consciousnesses. But if this conclusion is warranted there is no logical basis for the denial of consciousnesses to the lowest forms of animals that have nervous systems. If I refuse to agree that any such animal has a consciousness, then if I am logical I must hold with Descartes that all animals other than man are pure automata without consciousness. It is of course agreed that as the nervous systems of animals are of various grades of complexity so animals' consciousnesses must be of various grades of complexity.

We are thus led to the view that any system of minor systems of living elements is a living individual to whose

nerve activities corresponds a consciousness which is a system of psychic minor systems. We note also that in various forms of life the complexity of the great systems varies widely, and the interrelation and integration of the minor systems varies in degree. Now our minor nerve systems are correlated to form our individual human organisms: Some of the human minor nerve systems (e. g. optic ganglia) being as complex as the whole nerve systems of certain of the lower animals. We men, therefore, may be looked upon as complex systems of lower organic forms, as it were.

The question now arises, may it not be possible that we men are also minor physical systems in a broader organism. You will at once recall that many important thinkers have been led, by quite other evidence than that here presented, to note that we men and women act in relation with one another as though we were parts of an organic whole which they call the social body. And surely the modern conception of the nature of living organisms just spoken of serves to corroborate such a view.

But in considering such a conception we are at once brought to face a formidable objection, for in living individuals the minor nerve systems are not only related together to form the great nerve system, but are also closely integrated as we say, and they are directly connected. But there is no similar close relation or direct connection between individual men looked upon as parts of the social body.

This difficulty, however, seems very much less formidable as soon as we attempt to define what we mean by integration and connection. When I press the hand of any other living man his nervous system and mine are in

a measure connected, and they are so correlated that no change can occur in the nerve terminals in my hand without the occurrence of similar changes in his. The relation between my nervous system and my neighbor's under such conditions is not altogether unlike the relation between the brain and certain of the loosely related minor systems, e. g., the sympathetic nervous system, within my own body. Less directly, but not less certainly, we individuals in the social body find ourselves integrated and connected whenever we speak to one another, or communicate by writing; or indeed, whenever we are affected conjointly by the same objects in the world about us.

But if we thus waive this objection, its consideration draws our attention to the fact that if such a social organism exists of which we human beings are elements, the bond of integration between the human elements of the organism is of a very weak order. As we all know, individual men parts of this hypothetical social body may be separated away from it and still live, and the social body itself will not be materially injured by the separation. Again, human individuals may belong to several social groups and may without difficulty shift from one group to another. Such weakness of integration between the minor systems is found only among lower animal forms, and it would thus appear that if the social organism does exist it must be of a like low, organic type.

Now, if such a view as to the existence of a social body is tenable, and if it is true that all forms of life having nerve systems have consciousnesses, then it would appear that there must exist, corresponding with the social body, a social consciousness in which our human consciousness

are minor psychic systems. If such a social consciousness exists, however, it must correspond, as we have seen, with an organic system of low type; and this consciousness, therefore, must be of a very low grade of integration similar to such as we attribute to the lower animals. It cannot then be compared closely with the rational human consciousness, nor can it be expected to guide the human parts of the social body in the same manner as the rational human consciousness guides its conscious elements. We see examples of such non-rational lack of guidance in cases of mob activities. Men as members of a mob will, as we all know, act in relation to some individual as no one of them would act were he brought merely into personal relation with this individual.

We must note also another point of importance, viz., that even if such a social consciousness exists in which our consciousnesses are psychic parts, we individuals cannot know its nature immediately or with certainty. If the conception is warranted at all our individual consciousnesses are related to the social consciousnesses very much as a part of a man's consciousness, e. g., his sensations, is to his whole consciousness. It certainly would be absurd to claim that a sensation can know the nature of the individual whose consciousness contains this sensation.

Thus, it appears that individual men can know the nature of the social consciousness only very indirectly and inadequately. But we individuals deal with each other largely through our knowledge of their conscious states; and we as parts of the social organism might guide our action properly to its advantage, could we directly know the real nature of the social consciousness. But as this can only be imperfectly and indirectly known we can

only hope to guide our actions in relation to the welfare of the social body by the broadest sympathetic study of the whole race of men; and by the acceptance of their ideals and aspirations as important to the constitution of the whole. Thus does modern socio-biological theory enforce the same conceptions of duty taught by religious ethics.

At this juncture we may assume that our Martian spirit suddenly returns to our midst. He tells us that during his absence he has been studying biology, attending lectures and reading treatises on the subject; and he asks us what reason we have to limit our conception of conscious correspondence to the activity of nerve. He says "I have discovered that nerve is merely a special kind of protoplasm, and I have heard your famous biologist, Loeb, say that it is different from other protoplasm merely in the fact that it serves as a sensitive and quick protoplasmic conductor."

Now certainly this question of our Martian spirit is worth considering, for if his supposition is warranted, then it would seem that wherever there is protoplasmic activity, there must be some corresponding change of a psychic nature. And thus it would appear that my consciousness at any moment must correspond, not only with the activities of my nervous system, but with the whole throb of my living organism; although of course only that part of my consciousness that corresponds with a very limited part of my nerve activities will at any time appear in the field of awareness; all else will be absorbed in that vast field of sub-attentive consciousness of which we have already spoken.

If such a view as that above noted is to be entertained of course we are compelled to agree that all forms of

animal life have corresponding consciousnesses, even those in which no nervous systems at all are developed; and to such views some of our ablest biologists are today giving their adherence. But if the basis of this judgment is correct, then all protoplasmic activity must have its conscious correspondent; and in that case we must agree that to the slow and sluggish life of the plant there corresponds a slow and sluggish plant consciousness. This is a view which has been suggested by numerous philosophers in the past, and especially by the renowned Fechner.

We are now led to take still another step. We have just seen that we must agree that some form of consciousness must correspond with all forms of life. We had previously seen that human lives and consciousnesses may not improbably be parts of a broader social life to which corresponds a social consciousness. In closing, let me speak for a moment of a conception of deep interest to which we are naturally led if we consider these two conceptions in correlation.

If we turn back to consider the conception of consciousness as coincident with all of life, we discover that the basis of this view is found in the fact that life is a mode of transformation of energy. But the whole great complex physical system of the universe is a medium for the transformation of energy, and it is a vastly complex system of systems in which no action in one part can fail to affect all other parts, and no action in any part can be what it is apart from influences from the whole of the great system. Moreover, in this vastly complex system of the universe we human beings are subordinate parts.

Correspondingly, if our consciousnesses are subordinate parts in a broader social consciousness, the question arises

whether there may not be what we may call a universal consciousness, corresponding with the activities in the highly complex physical system of the universe; a universal consciousness of which we are exceedingly subordinate parts, effective in modifying the nature of this universal consciousness, and in all our activities affected by it.

This is a conception of ancient lineage. It has been suggested by many of the greatest philosophers. It has usually been looked upon, however, as highly imaginative and somewhat fanciful; but to me it seems a most noble one, and one that must be taken very seriously by us if we carry to its legitimate conclusions our newly acquired knowledge. In order that you may realize how seriously this conception is taken in our day, I shall close my remarks by reading a few sentences from the writings of three important philosophers of our day, whose standpoints are as diverse as it is possible for philosophical standpoints to be.

First, I shall quote from Dr. Stout whom James, I imagine, would call one of the hard-hearted psychologists. He has written a notable analytical Psychology in which we find the following remarks:

"If the doctrine of psychophysical parallelism is true, the reason of the connexion between conscious process and correlated nervous process is not to be found in the nervous and conscious processes themselves. Both must be regarded as belonging to a more comprehensive system of conditions; and it is within this system as a whole that the reason of their connexion is to be sought. In particular the individual's consciousness, as we know it, must be regarded as a fragment of a wider whole, by which its origin and its changes are determined. As the brain

forms only a fragmentary portion of the total system of material phenomena, so we must assume the stream of individual consciousness to be in like manner part of an immaterial system. We must further assume that this immaterial system in its totality is related to the material world in its totality as the individual consciousness is related to nervous processes taking place in the cortex of the brain."

I shall now ask you to listen to a few sentences from a man whom we may call a soft-hearted psychologist, from the eminent Prof. William James. In his "Varieties of Religious Experiences" referring to certain of his early experiments, he says:

"One conclusion was forced upon my mind at that time, and my impression of its truth has ever since remained unshaken. It is that our normal waking consciousness, rational consciousness as we call it, is but one special type of consciousness; whilst all about it, parted from it by the filmiest of screens, there lie potential forms of consciousness entirely different. . . . No account of the universe in its totality can be final which leaves these other forms of consciousness quite disregarded."

And now, finally, let me read to you a few lines written by James' close personal friend, but arch philosophical enemy, Josiah Royce. In his "World and the Individual, he tells us:

"We have no right whatever to speak of really unconscious Nature, but only of uncommunicative Nature, or of Nature whose mental processes go on at such different time-rates from ours that we cannot adjust ourselves to a live appreciation of their inward fluency, although our consciousness does make us aware of their presence. My hypothesis is that, in case of Nature in general, as in the



3 0112 110189500

case of the particular portions of Nature known as our fellow-men, we are dealing with phenomena of a vast conscious process, whose relation to time varies vastly, but whose general characteristics are throughout the same. From this point of view, evolution would be a series of processes suggesting to us various degrees and types of conscious processes. The processes, in case of so-called inorganic matter, are very remote from us; while in the case of the processes which appear to us as the expressive movements of the bodies of our human fellows, they are so near to our own inner processes that we understand what they mean. I suppose then that when you deal with Nature you deal with a vast realm of finite consciousness of which your own is at once a part and an example."

